1897

1897

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON.

The Remonstrance is published by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, New York, Maine, Illinois, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Mrs. James M. Codman.
Mrs. C. H. Colburn.
Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge.
Mrs. James M. Crafts.
Miss Sarah H. Crocker.
Mrs. James C. Fisk.
Mrs. Charles E. Guild.
Mrs. Charles D. Homans.
Miss E. H. Houghton.
Miss Elizabeth Johnson.
Mrs. Francis C. Lowell.
Mrs. Oliver W. Peabody.
Mrs. Philip H. Sears.
Mrs. William T. Sedgwick.
Mrs. G. H. Shaw.
Miss E. P. Sohier.
Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.
Mrs. Robert W. Lord, Secretary, 56 St. Stephen's Street, Boston.
Laurence Minot, Treasurer, 39 Court Street, Boston.

THE MAJORITY HEARD FROM.

THE suffragists who gathered at St. Louis before the assembling of the Republican National Convention, June 16, 1896, were surprised after they had made their appeal to the committee on resolutions to listen to an earnest appeal on the other side by Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell, of Albany. Mrs. Crannell made a very favorable impression upon the committee, and her address was fully reported in the newspaper accounts of the convention.

The following month, Mrs. Crannell, at the request of women in New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Connecticut, South Carolina, Arkansas, California, Illinois, Michigan, Iowa, and other States, appeared before the committee on resolutions of the Democratic National Convention at Chicago to protest, in the name of the great majority of American women, against any declaration which could be construed as favorable to woman suffrage. Her argument was heard with the utmost respect and was again fully reported.

The Republican Convention made a vague declaration in favor of "the admission of women to wider spheres of usefulness"; the Democratic Convention was silent upon the question.

ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS IN VERMONT.

IT was commented upon with surprise, in the newspapers which reported the debate in the Vermont House of Representatives which ended in the defeat of the municipal suffrage bill, that the members who spoke against the bill, as well as those who spoke in favor of the bill, were warmly applauded by women present.

These comments reflect the very common but mistaken impression that the majority of women want the ballot, and that an audience of women may therefore be expected to applaud only those speakers who take that view.

The precise opposite is true. The great majority of women do not want the ballot. This was shown conclusively in Massachusetts when less than five per cent of them expressed a desire for the municipal ballot. The trouble hitherto has been that the minority who do want the ballot have been so clamorous that legislators and the public have imagined that they spoke for the sex; while the majority of women, restrained by their natural shrinking from publicity, and imperfectly realizing the dangers of the situation, have kept silent.

The Vermont incident showed that in that State, as elsewhere, the women who believe that it would be a grave injustice to force the ballot upon women are beginning to be heard. The anti-suffrage organizations among women in Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, and other States are proofs that the too long latent opposition of women to the ballot is taking definite shape.

AS TO WYOMING.

THE Idaho Register, of Idaho Falls, commenting upon an address given at that place during the suffrage campaign by Mrs. Catt, gave the following personal testimony regarding Wyoming: —

It seems that she has allowed some enthusiast in Wyoming to fill her mind with wonderful stories about the results of equal suffrage in that State, and she, taking them as true statements, tells them as such. From some of them one is led to believe that Wyoming is a paradise.

She demonstrated that the compulsory education law was responsible for the small per cent of criminals in the penitentiary, and of idiocy in the State, and then claimed that this was the fruit of female suffrage.

One who was not better informed would imagine that the juries and political conventions were mostly composed of women.

The writer was a resident of Wyoming from 1870 to 1880, and during that time attended every territorial convention, both Republican and Democratic, and every county convention in the two western counties that were held during that time, and no woman ever sat as delegate in any one of them; and it was usually only by urging and stating that others had voted, and their vote was wanted to offset it, that a large portion of the women could be induced to vote.

IS IT WORTH WHILE?

THE returns of the votes cast at the last election in the States where women voted may be scanned in vain for any indication of the effect of women's vote. It is conceded even by suffragists that these States, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah, voted just as they would have done if only men had gone to the polls. But if admitting women to the ballot simply doubles the vote without changing the result, is it worth while for this to throw the responsibilities of the ballot upon women?

LEGISLATURES AND THE PEOPLE.

THE vote in Idaho and California on the suffrage constitutional amendments submitted at the election, November 3, carries a suggestion to our Legislatures.

In Idaho the proposition was adopted by the Legislature with little opposition. All of the four political parties which held State conventions warmly indorsed it. Under these circumstances it might have been supposed that the vote of the people would be practically unanimous. But when the votes were counted it was found that, although a majority of the votes cast upon it were in favor, it received the support of less than half of the voters who went to the polls. It became a part of the Constitution, through the decision of the Supreme Court; although only a minority of the voters voted for it.

In California the Legislature adopted the suffrage resolution by a strong vote. Most of the political conventions declared in favor of it. Nearly all of the influential papers of the State either favored the amendment or gave generous space to arguments for it. The suffragists waged an active campaign for months upon the stump; yet, when the proposition came to the people, a considerable majority voted against it and defeated it.

The trouble with legislators is that they are liable to mistake the clamor of an interested few for the demand of the people. This explains why it is that suffragists are always more anxious to secure legislative action than they are to take their chances with the people.

GOLDWIN SMITH ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

WRITING from Toronto to the London Times, May 7, 1896, upon woman suffrage, Prof. Goldwin Smith said: —

Woman calls on man to give up to her half the sovereign power, himself retaining the responsibility; for nature will still hold him responsible both for the family and the State. With you, it is true, it is at present proposed to give the suffrage only to unmarried women, but the leaders of the movement have no intention of stopping there. Nor would reason let us stop there.

Before taking this leap, might it not be well to inquire into the working of the measure where it has been already adopted — that is to say, in three of the Western States of the American Union and in Australasia? Reports that come to us of the results in the Western States indicate that inquiry would be wise.

In mature and sober Massachusetts woman suffrage, after a long agitation, was defeated by an overwhelming majority. By the Constitutional Convention of the State of New York it was rejected by a majority of two to one.

No grievance, I believe, has been named, either in America or in England, which male Legislatures have refused to redress. The movement in both countries seems to have its origin and support, not among the women who bear the burdens of the sex and would be most likely to feel any actual grievance, but among the women who wish to wield political power and to go into public life.

I find general opinion in the United States, so far as I can ascertain it, adverse to the change. The new woman, perhaps, shows herself there even in a more startling way than with you. . . .

There are, it should be observed, two movements. There is a movement for the extension of female employment in the interest of unmarried women thrown on their own resources for subsistence. With this we can all sympathize, though unfortunately it sometimes takes away the bread from men who have wives and children to support. There is another movement the object of which is nothing less than a sexual revolution transferring political power to the women, deposing the head of the family, forcing women into male employments, and breaking down, as far as possible, every barrier which nature or custom has established between the sexes. It is with the second movement that we have now to deal, and it must be regarded and treated as a whole.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND WAGES.

UPON the relation of woman suffrage to wages, "E. S. C." writes in the New York Tribune: —

The women who are agitating the question of giving suffrage to women use as an argument to bring the working-women into sympathy with them the assertion that when women vote all women will be employed at increased wages. The fallacy of this argument is seen in the fact that so many men who are voters are idle, and also in the frequency of strikes; for if wages and suffrage bore any relative value, there would be no men out of employment and no need of any united demand for an increase of wages or protest against their decrease.

It is an acknowledged fact that wages can be kept up only by keeping the demand a little beyond the supply; that is, by narrowing competition. Everywhere the wage is regulated by demand and supply; and as women enter the field as competitors with men, the result is always that instead of wages being increased for women, they are lowered for men. The reason of this is obvious; competition is closer among women than among men, and they can support themselves on lower wages. Many girls on leaving school enter employment as a means of obtaining money for extra clothing or trinkets, and not as a means of livelihood. This is furnished them by the fathers and brothers whose places they are usurping and whose wages they are lowering.

Wages will never be a question of the ballot. Low wages will obtain as long as there is illegitimate competition; and as long as young women enter the shop or factory as a bridge to span the interval between school and marriage, so long there will be unfair competition. The workers in large proportion see this. When the protest against striking the word "male" from the Constitution was being signed in Albany, hundreds of young women employed in shops and factories came to the headquarters to sign the protest. One of them said that a suffrage petition had been handed to her with the statement that if she could vote she would have higher wages; to which she replied, "I am now receiving more than my father does, and he votes."

In a similar vein is this, from a thoughtful article by Clare de Graffenried, in the Popular Science Monthly for September, 1896: —

One fault, however, of modern industrialism is that girls rush hastily, blindly, and sometimes unnecessarily, into self-supporting pursuits for which they are unfitted, and to the neglect of a legion of home duties. Then, having cut down pay below the life line for the self-supporting toiler, these transients join in condemning merchant and manufacturer for offering no more than starvation wages. Better economic conditions for women will not come until they enter the field less hastily and on strictly business terms; until they are trained enough, stable and responsible enough, to deserve these ameliorations, and capable of the concerted and unselfish action required to win them.

ADVICE TO SUFFRAGISTS.

WOMAN suffrage is a fair subject for discussion, but it has not yet got beyond its academic stage. Every time it invites a vote it is beaten, and it is often beaten in a way which leads people to believe that it is making no advance in public opinion. If woman suffrage is to succeed in the future, as its adherents claim and doubtless believe, their best policy is forbearance of tests for the present, and the first step in this direction indicated is that they cease to carry it before the Legislature. — *Boston Herald.*

THE DEFEAT OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN CALIFORNIA.

THE advocates of woman suffrage certainly cannot claim that they did not have a fair show in California. The Republican State Convention incorporated a woman-suffrage plank in the platform. A number of leading newspapers, in city and country, advocated it. Two leading San Francisco dailies — the Morning Call and the Evening Post — sustained the woman-suffrage cause, and gave much space to it every day. The State was thoroughly canvassed by enthusiastic ladies. Miss Susan B. Anthony and Miss Anna Shaw "stumped" the State. Concerning their ability, their enthusiasm, and their eloquence, there can be no question. There was little opposition from the press. Republican journals which did not advocate woman suffrage did not, at all events, combat it. That was the position of the Argonaut. We could not conscientiously advocate woman suffrage under present conditions, but we refrained from opposing it, and we gave some space in our columns to its advocates. We even went so far as to refrain from printing a number of letters from women *against* woman suffrage — which, by the way, outnumbered those from women in favor of woman suffrage.

On the whole, therefore, it is evident that the advocates of woman suffrage had an unusually favorable opportunity this year to battle for their cause. They have failed — failed most lamentably, most disastrously. The voters of California are overwhelmingly opposed to giving the ballot to women.— *San Francisco Argonaut.*

The only conspicuous paper in the State which opposed the adoption of the amendment was the Chronicle, and that journal's opposition was so mild as to scarcely attract attention. The truth about this matter probably is, that the women of California defeated the amendment themselves. There is little question that the men submitted the proposition to their wives, mothers, and sweethearts. We know for a fact that that was generally done in this city. We know, also, that hereabouts the ladies told their male friends that if given the franchise they would not vote. In our judgment it is not the men of California upon whom the woman suffragists should concentrate their efforts. They should educate their own sex to demand the ballot.— *San Francisco Post.*

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS.

IF men of refinement are deterred from the necessary political activities by the rudeness of the contacts inseparable from them, is it not probable that refined women will be still more so deterred? Is it not probable that many women, belonging to the most estimable element of society, would keep aloof from all contact with politics on principle, believing it to be outside of their sphere? Is it not probable that even more female than male voters would be ignorant or careless of public questions, or easily reached and controlled by extraneous, especially sectarian, influences, or personal considerations, or anything that appeals more to the emotions than to reason? Is it not probable, in one word, that, while doubtless a limited element of excellent quality would be added to the voting force, not only the positive quantity, but the proportion in it of the element to which some of our most serious troubles are owing, would be largely increased? — *Carl Schurz.*

THE NEW WOMAN IN UTAH.

A BIOGRAPHICAL sketch of the career of Martha Hughes Cannon, who ran against her alleged husband for the Utah Senate and beat him by 4,000 votes, throws some rather vivid light on this remarkable family episode. The fact is that Mrs. Cannon is not the wife of the man who ran against her, if there is any virtue in the law abolishing polygamy in that State. The man in the case married two sisters under the Mormon *régime*, and when the United States bade him reject one he refused. Not only did he refuse, but he married two other women, the last being the present senator-elect. The new senator has, therefore, no legal marital status. But being a Mormon, and believing that polygamy is the natural state and the right one, she is not troubled. It 's a queer state of things that allows the law to be set at defiance by one of the chosen lawmakers. — *Boston Herald.*

WITHOUT THE LEGAL MIND.

HAS woman that mental quality which makes a legislator? There is a certain quality which falls under the name of the legal mind. It is not a knowledge of law, nor is it a sense of justice. It is a certain grasp on all facts and truths and circumstances bearing on the question; it is a certain penetrating conception of the way in which human society is bound together; it is the synthetic as distinct from the analytic faculty; it is a clear sense of the nature of law; it is a clear view of what can be done and what cannot be done, what ought to be attempted and what not attempted; it is that firm and steady reason which outmasters prejudice; it is all this and more; hard to define but easily recognized. It is as clearly defined a quality as imagination or taste.

My question is, Has woman ordinarily the legal mind? As it is a high quality, I hesitate to say that she has not it, and that it is a peculiarly masculine quality and it will always remain such, and that its secret will never be learned by her. When nature set out in its task of perfecting woman by specialization of function, it endowed her with certain qualities and bade her give full play to them; it gave her sympathy, insight, taste, sentiment, love of beauty, patience, reverence, piety, self-sacrifice, humility, all great and commanding qualities, but it did not give her the legal mind. — *The Rev. T. T. Munger, D.D.*

"CLASS" LEGISLATION UNWISE.

MANY thoughtful persons are convinced that the average woman is far more likely than the average man of the same condition in life to act upon some other motive than mature disinterested judgment, and that the enfranchisement of women might add to the number of voters, already far too numerous in our country, who are led by tradition or self-interest or emotion, rather than by intelligent zeal for the welfare of the whole nation.

If this opinion is an erroneous one, the advocates of the enfranchisement of women ~~must, as their first step, not only prove its error, but they~~ must also prove that the participation of women in politics would make government distinctly better than it is now, for no change in established institutions which is not a definite advance can be considered. Nor can the plea that the votes of women would benefit women as a class be admitted; for every act of class legislation is a national disaster, and no democratic government can recognize the existence, before the law, of any class with interests which are not those of the whole nation. — *Prof. W. K. Brooks, in The Forum for November 1896.*

WOMAN IN POLITICS.

THE Melbourne correspondent of the London Times, telegraphing under date of December 14, says: —

"Details of the general election in New Zealand show that only five members of the Labour party have been returned. The supposed influence of women's suffrage in elevating politics has not been realized. A meeting of women at Dunedin was characterized by extreme rowdiness. A lady speaker was howled down by the mob, there was frantic screaming, and the women were frightened off the platform. The chairman was hooted and threatened, and was compelled to close the meeting."

There was an incident somewhat like this last summer in one of the Western States, Colorado, if our memory serves us, where the woman chairman of a county convention, whose rulings were distasteful to a large proportion of the delegates, was assailed with bitter epithets, and the convention hall reduced for a time to a pandemonium.

Both incidents illustrate what may be called the seamy side of politics for women. No one can defend the irregular and disorderly proceedings of the men, either in New Zealand or in Colorado. But human nature must be taken as it is. Politics is a rough game in which blows are given and taken. If women enter politics, it will have to be on the same terms as men.

For a time, possibly, and perhaps always in some communities, the force of old habits will be so strong that women in active politics will be treated with deference because of their sex; but in general this cannot be expected to last. The position of special privilege which women now hold, and the position of absolute political equality which a misguided minority of women seek, are inconsistent and conflicting. They cannot indefinitely occupy both. When they talk from the political stump, preside over political conventions, and contest political offices, they must expect to be treated as men are who do the same things.

True, the old spirit of chivalry toward women will die hard. We do not believe that it is best for the race that it should die at all. But such incidents as these in New Zealand and in Colorado suggest that it is not likely long to survive the full entrance of women into politics. — *Boston Journal.*

OPPOSITION TO WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

THE first annual report of the New York State Association Opposed to the Extension of the Suffrage to Women has just been issued by the executive committee. It contains a statement of the work of the association in opposing the efforts to have the Legislature pass a suffrage amendment to the constitution, and the organization of branches throughout the State. The officers are as follows: Executive Committee — Mrs. Francis M. Scott, Chairman, No. 42 Park Avenue; Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Treasurer, No. 9 Lexington Avenue; Mrs. George White Field, Mrs. David H. Greer, Mrs. C. Grant La Farge, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer, Mrs. George Waddington, Mrs. Everett P. Wheeler; Mrs. George Phillips, Secretary, No. 169 East Sixtieth Street. Finance Committee — Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Chairman; Mrs. William C. Gulliver, Mrs. Gilbert E. Jones, Mrs. Ternor L. Park, Miss Julia Wells. Press Committee — Mrs. C. Grant La Farge, Chairman; Miss Jeannette L. Gilder, Mrs. Alfred Meyer. — *New York Evening Post.*

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1894.

Bills to confer municipal suffrage upon women were defeated in the Legislatures of Massachusetts and Vermont. In the Iowa Senate, a proposition to submit a suffrage constitutional amendment to the people was defeated. In New York, the Constitutional Convention refused to submit to the people an amendment striking out the word "male" from the Constitution. In Kansas, a constitutional amendment, giving to women the full rights of suffrage, was defeated by the people at the election November 6, by a majority of 34,827.

IN 1895.

In California, bills for municipal suffrage and for full suffrage for women failed; but a joint resolution was passed submitting to the people in 1896 a suffrage constitutional amendment.

In Connecticut, a municipal suffrage bill was passed by the House, but rejected by the Senate. A Presidential suffrage bill did not reach a vote.

In Illinois, a bill conferring upon women the right of township suffrage was twice defeated by the Senate.

In Indiana, a constitutional amendment, striking the word "male" from the Constitution of the State, was introduced, but secured no support and was not reported by the committee to which it was referred.

In Kansas, a bill was passed by the Senate giving full suffrage to nine women who had petitioned for it, and who were named in the bill. The Senate also passed a bill conferring upon women the right to vote for Presidential electors. Neither bill reached a vote in the House.

In Maine, the House passed a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women, but the Senate defeated it: Yeas, 11; Nays, 15.

In Massachusetts, the House refused a third reading to a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women. The vote, including pairs, was: Yeas, 97; Nays, 137. An Act was passed permitting all persons qualified to vote for school committee to express their opinion at the State election by voting Yes or No to the question, "Is it expedient that municipal suffrage be granted to women?" When the election took place the men voters voted against the proposition more than two to one, and only about four per cent of the women of the State voted in favor of it. The vote of the men was: Yes, 86,970; No, 186,976; of the women, Yes, 22,204; No, 864.

In Michigan, a proposition to submit a woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated.

In Missouri, February 25, a resolution providing for submitting a woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated in the House, 43 to 65.

In Montana, a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment was defeated in the Senate.

In North Dakota, a bill conferring full suffrage upon women, subject to a referendum to the people, was defeated by the House.

In Rhode Island, a resolution for a constitutional amendment was referred to the next Legislature.

In South Dakota, the House tabled a resolution providing for submitting a constitutional amendment which the Senate had adopted.

In Washington, a resolution for a constitutional amendment was adopted by the Senate, but defeated by the House.

In Wisconsin, April 13, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Assembly: Yeas, 33; Nays, 49.

IN 1896.

In Massachusetts, March 25, the House of Representatives defeated a proposed woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution without calling for the Yeas and Nays. March 31, the House defeated, by a vote of 81 Yeas to 104 Nays, a bill to confer upon women the right to vote upon the License question; and immediately after rejected by an overwhelming vote a bill to confer municipal suffrage upon women.

In Vermont, the Senate passed a bill proposing to confer municipal suffrage upon women taxpayers; but the House defeated the bill: Yeas, 89; Nays, 135.

In Iowa, a suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated in the Senate.

In Rhode Island, a resolution for a suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated in the House.

In California, a constitutional amendment conferring the full rights of suffrage upon women was defeated by the people, at the election November 3.

PUBLIC OPINION NOT READY.

THE decisive vote on woman suffrage at the recent State election would seem to show that public opinion will not for some time be prepared to accept any radical change in the established system of suffrage. — *Governor Frederic T. Greenhalge's last address to the Legislature of Massachusetts, January 2, 1896.*

On both of these important questions (woman suffrage and biennial elections), which have demanded so much time of your predecessors, the decision of the people was so emphatic as to afford little encouragement for an early renewal of the discussion. — *Governor Roger Wolcott's address to the Legislature of Massachusetts, January 7, 1897.*